JESUS IS LORD *Notice to the master is notice to the servant. Notice to the servant is notice to the master. [in red ink]*

RECEIVED
SDNY PRO SE OFFICE
2017 AUG 22 PM 1:46
S.D. OF N.Y.

'Federal Court'
at
'District Court of the united States
For the Southern District Court of New York'

a man: david: [house of lawrence] the aggrieved party	)	**17CV 6437**
	)	Action No. cv 17-
prosecutor	)	
______________________	)	
	)	DECREED
Susan T. Kluewer	)	
Michael J. Sposato	)	***Waiver of fees***
William D. Shanahan; John Doe (s);	)	
	)	
Wrongdoer(s)	)	*verified*

WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

i; david; a man; a bondservant of Jesus Christ: present notice; that; 'My Case'; the original Writ of Habeas Corpus'; guaranteed to Me by the united states Constitution and protects by same as indicted in your law [cf. Article one; Section nine; *and New York Constitution Article one Section four: hereby claim My right to a Republican form of government as stated in your law* ***[cf. constitution of the united States*** ***Article four Section four :*** *The United States shall guarantee to every state in this union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence.]*

i: david; a man: am guaranteed a constitutional court [cf. ***SCOTT v. NEELY, (1891)****The constitution, in its seventh amendment, declares that 'in suits at common law where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved.' In the federal courts* ***this right cannot be dispensed with****, except by the assent of the [140 U.S. 106, 110] parties entitled to it;* ***nor can it be impaired by any blending with a claim, properly cognizable at law, of a demand for equitable relief in aid of the legal action, or during its pendency.*** *Such aid in the federal courts must be sought in separate proceedings, to the end that the right to a trial by a jury in the legal action may be preserved intact.]*

The constitution is interpreted by the 'common law' ***[cf.*** *South Carolina v. United States]; and as such; [cf. suits in common law the right of trial by jury shall be preserved. United States. constitution seventh amendment to the constitution]*

JESUS IS LORD *Notice to the master is notice to the servant. Notice to the servant is notice to the master. [in red ink]*

i; david; a man; a bondservant of Jesus Christ: demand that all fees be waived.[cf. ***Ex parte Bakelite Corp., 279 U.S. 438 (1929)*** *While Article III of the Constitution declares, in section 1, that the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in "such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish," and prescribes, in section 2, that this power shall extend to cases and controversies of certain enumerated classes, it long has been settled that Article III does not express the full authority of Congress to create courts, and that other articles invest Congress with powers in the exertion of which it may create inferior courts and clothe them with functions deemed essential or helpful in carrying those powers into execution.* ***But there is a difference between the two classes of courts. Those established under the specific power given in section 2 of Article III are called constitutional courts.*** *They share in the exercise of the judicial power defined in that section, can be invested with no other jurisdiction, and have judges who hold office during good behavior, with no power in Congress to provide otherwise.* ***On the other hand, those created by Congress in the exertion of other powers are called legislative courts. Their functions always are directed to the execution of one or more of such powers, and are prescribed by Congress independently of section 2 of Article III****; and their judges hold for such term as Congress prescribes, whether it be a fixed period of years or during good behavior.*

The first pronouncement on the subject by this Court was in American Insurance Co. v. Canter, 1 Pet. 511, where the status and jurisdiction of courts created by Congress for the Territory of Florida were drawn in question. Chief Justice Marshall, speaking for the court, said, p. 26 U. S. 546:These Courts, then, are not constitutional Courts, in which the judicial power conferred by the Constitution on the general government can be deposited. They are incapable of receiving it. They are legislative courts, created in virtue of the general right of sovereignty which exists in the government, or in virtue of that clause which enables Congress to make all needful rules and regulations, respecting the territory belonging to the United States. The jurisdiction with which they are invested is not a part of that judicial power which is defined in the 3d article of the Constitution, but is conferred by Congress, in the execution of those general powers which that body possesses over the territories of the United States"]

*Your law stipulates that the people are supreme not the state; the people of the State are entitled all rights which formerly belonged to the king [****cf.*** *PEOPLE. People are supreme, not the state.* ***Waring vs. the Mayor of Savanah, 60 Georgiaat 93****]; The state cannot diminish rights of the people. [cf.* ***Hertado v. California, 100 US 516****]; Preamble to the US and NY Constitutions - We the people ... do ordain and establish this Constitution...; ...at the Revolution, the sovereignty devolved on the people; and they are truly the sovereigns of the country, but they are sovereigns without subjects...with none to govern but themselves... [****CHISHOLM v. GEORGIA (US) 2 Dall 419, 454, 1 L Ed 440, 455, 2 DALL (1793) pp471-472****]: The people of this State, as the successors of its former sovereign, are entitled to all the rights which formerly belonged to the King by his prerogative. [****Lansing v. Smith, 4 Wend. 9 (N.Y.) (1829), 21 Am. Dec. 89 10C Const. Law Sec. 298; 18 C Em.Dom. Sec. 3, 228; 37 C Nav.Wat. Sec. 219; Nuls Sec. 167; 48 C Wharves Sec. 3, 7.****]*

JESUS IS LORD *Notice to the master is notice to the servant. Notice to the servant is notice to the master. [in red ink]*

As a man; a creation of the Living God; and; a people on the land of New York; i; do not consent to be labeled as the entity known as 'poor person';

i; david; a man; am guaranteed a Writ of Habeas Corpus as stated in your law; and; bound by your oath of office [cf. U.S. Constitution: Amendment one]

i; david; a man; a bondservant of the Lord Jesus Christ; demand to b called a man; and go as the man My Heavenly Father care Me to be: **Genesis 1:27 king James Version**: *"God created man in his own image. in the image of God created he him."*

The use of any statutes, codes, rules, regulations, or court citations, within any document created by Me, at any time, is only to notice that which is applicable to government officials, and is not intended, nor shall it be construed, to mean that i: a man have conferred, submitted to, or entered into any jurisdiction alluded to thereby.

By: david: house of

david: (house of Lawrence).

Sealed in the name of and the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; Amen

Dated this twentysecond day of August in the year of our Lord Two Thousand and Seventeen

God is My Witness

Romans 1:9 King James Version *"For God is my witness, whom I serve with my spirit in the gospel of his Son, that without ceasing I make mention of you always in my prayers;"* Job 16: 19 King James Version *Also now, behold, my witness is in heaven, and my record is on high.*

JESUS IS LORD *Notice to the master is notice to the servant. Notice to the servant is notice to the master. [in red ink]*

SDNY PRO SE OFFICE
2017 AUG 22 PM 1:46
S.D. OF N.Y.

'Federal Court'
at
'District Court of the united States
For the Southern District Court of New York'

a man: david: house of lawrence the aggrieved party	)	Trial by Jury Demanded-protected by the sixth and seventh amendments
	)	
	)	Action No. cv
prosecutor	)	
	)	DECREED
Susan T. Kluewer	)	
Michael J. Sposato	)	
William D. Shanahan; John Doe (s)	)	
Wrongdoer(s)	)	***verified***

Emergency Great Writ of Habeas Corpus

For the record and upon your Oath of Office; this writ is under reserve. This writ is under the blood covenant of the Lord Jesus, the Christ and savior of my soul. As a bondservant of Jesus Christ, i; a man; have no need to be a part of your corporation i: am not a statue entity. i: david; a man; reserve all my God given rights. i: david: a man: would like to make it clear that i: a man; am not 'pro se'; a person or a Corporation: i: am a man; i: go by My God given name, david: and as a bondservant of Jesus Christ; i: a man: demand that you address Me by My given name; david: Jesus called one name and only one man answered to that name for his name is his gift from God. **Isaiah 43:1** - ***But now thus saith the LORD that created thee, ... Fear not: for I have redeemed thee, I have called [thee] by thy name; thou [art] mine***. Further, notice that Lazarus was dead and came forth at Jesus' call no longer bound by sin he answered the Lord's call. Jesus ordered that he be **loosed and let go** and as a bondservant of the Lord Jesus Christ son of the Living God, i; am not to be addressed by a '*nom de guerre*' or any derivative thereof. i; too am loosed and let go from any and all laws that are not those of the Living God. **KJV Bible 1611 –** ***John 11:43*** "*And when he thus had spoken, he cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth.* ***44.*** *And he that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot with grave clothes: and his face was bound about with a napkin. Jesus saith unto them, Loose him, and let him go.* **John 10:3** King James Version Bible - *To him the porter openeth; and the sheep hear his voice: and* ***he calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out.*** By your law i: david a man God given rights protected by the United States Constitution can't be abrogate by any man or woman that takes oath to the United States Constitution your law ***[cf Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436: "Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation, which would abrogate them."***

All rights reserved

JESUS IS LORD *Notice to the master is notice to the servant. Notice to the servant is notice to the master. [in red ink]*

And further; under common law jurisdiction, i; david: a man: reserve all my God given rights protected by the united states Constitution. In addition, the man or woman that has taken an oath to protect the United States Constitution is forbidden to make this court legislative court by your law ***[cf. Ex parte Bakelite Corp., 279 U.S. 438 (1929) While Article III of the Constitution declares, in section 1, that the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in "such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish," and prescribes, in section 2, that this power shall extend to cases and controversies of certain enumerated classes, it long has been settled that Article III does not express the full authority of Congress to create courts, and that other articles invest Congress with powers in the exertion of which it may create inferior courts and clothe them with functions deemed essential or helpful in carrying those powers into execution. But there is a difference between the two classes of courts. Those established under the specific power given in section 2 of Article III are called constitutional courts. They share in the exercise of the judicial power defined in that section, can be invested with no other jurisdiction, and have judges who hold office during good behavior, with no power in Congress to provide otherwise. On the other hand, those created by Congress in the exertion of other powers are called legislative courts. Their functions always are directed to the execution of one or more of such powers, and are prescribed by Congress independently of section 2 of Article III; and their judges hold for such term as Congress prescribes, whether it be a fixed period of years or during good behavior.***

The first pronouncement on the subject by this Court was in American Insurance Co. v. Canter, 1 Pet. 511, where the status and jurisdiction of courts created by Congress for the Territory of Florida were drawn in question. Chief Justice Marshall, speaking for the court, said, p. 26 U. S. 546: These Courts, then, are not constitutional Courts, in which the judicial power conferred by the Constitution on the general government can be deposited. They are incapable of receiving it. They are legislative courts, created in virtue of the general right of sovereignty which exists in the government, or in virtue of that clause which enables Congress to make all needful rules and regulations, respecting the territory belonging to the United States. The jurisdiction with which they are invested is not a part of that judicial power which is defined in the 3d article of the Constitution, but is conferred by Congress, in the execution of those general powers which that body possesses over the territories of the United States."]

i; david: a man: demand a writ of habeas Corpus under article one section nine a constitutional court a court of record under the common law. Your law dictates to you that i; david: a man: have the right to a constitutional court ***[cf. SCOTT v. NEELY, (1891) The constitution, in its seventh amendment, declares that 'in suits at common law where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved.' In the federal courts this right cannot be dispensed with, except by the assent of the [140 U.S. 106, 110] parties entitled to it; nor can it be impaired by any blending with a claim, properly cognizable at law, of a demand for equitable relief in aid of the legal action, or during its pendency. Such aid in the federal courts must be sought in separate proceedings, to the end that the right to a trial by a jury in the legal action may be preserved intact.]***

All rights reserved

JESUS IS LORD *Notice to the master is notice to the servant. Notice to the servant is notice to the master. [in red ink]*

Your law dictates to you that there is no choice to ignore your jurisdiction [*cf.* **Joyce v. US, 474 F2d 215** *There is no discretion to ignore that lack of jurisdiction.*] **EXHIBIT ONE** ***the court transcript of cases CR-006525-16NA the twenty sixth day of May the year of our Lord two thousand and sixteen;***
page four; lines twenty to twenty five says the following; i; david; a man; say - are you going to ignore 'Joyce v. U.S.';
Paul Meli: - "your request is denied"; i: david: a man: - "i'm asking for the record"
Paul Meli: - it's denied; i: david; a man: - 'for the record, are you saying, that you are not acknowledging 'Joyce v. US'?"

page eight; line eight to eighteen; Paul Meli: - 'the court acknowledged that you entered no plea to the charges' david; a man: - 'i entered no plea because you have not proven jurisdiction. i: want to make that clear. **This court did not prove jurisdiction. Paul Meli: - 'you have made it clear';** Your law says there is no ignoring your jurisdiction [*cf.* **Joyce v. US, 474 F2d 215** *There is no discretion to ignore that lack of jurisdiction.*]

The above example proves that Paul Meli issued a void order for i: david: a man: without proof of jurisdiction Christopher Mango; an agent of Madeline Singas, is witness to the fact that there is no plea given because Constitutional jurisdiction was not proven on the record: **Page seven line fourteen to seventeen** Christopher Mango;Your honor the people are right now, if he is not entering a plea, we are not trying to prevent him from having any of his rights and the people are not seeking a plea at this time.
page eight; line eight to eighteen; Paul Meli: - 'the court acknowledged that you entered no plea to the charges. **david; a man**: -'i entered no plea because you have not proven jurisdiction. i: want to make that clear, t**his court did not prove jurisdiction. Paul Meli: - 'you have made it clear';** The preceding example proves that Paul Meli issued a void order for i: david: a man: without proof of constitution jurisdiction.

False imprisonment is necessarily a wrongful interference with the personal liberty of a man or woman. The *wrong* may be committed by words alone or by acts alone, or by both, and by merely operating on the will of the individual, or by personal violence, or by both. It is not necessary that the man or woman be confined within a prison or within walls, or that he be assaulted or even touched. It is not necessary that there should be any injury done to the man or woman's character or reputation; nor is it necessary that the wrongful act be committed with malice or ill will, or even with the slightest wrongful intention; nor is it necessary that the act be under color of any legal or judicial proceeding. **All that is necessary is that the man or woman be restrained of his liberty without any sufficient legal cause therefor, and bywords or acts which he fears to disregard.**

False imprisonment exists not only by words or acts that one fears to disregard, but also by such acts and measures that he cannot disregard. No fear of disobedience need to exist. **If someone causes a situation that makes it impossible for another to exercise their liberty or**

All rights reserved

locomotion, it is a false imprisonment. Susan T. Kluewer made void order that restrain the liberty of i; david; a man; and never proved her constitutional jurisdiction on the record.

EXHIBIT TWO ***the*** transcripts of ***the fifteenth day of June in the year of our Lord two thousand and sixteen page*** **page four, lines seventeen to twenty-two - Susan T. Kluewer:** *Are you hiring an attorney sir?* **i: david; a man** - *Are you going to prove jurisdiction?* **Susan T. Kluewer:** *sir,* ***it is not my burden*** *sir?*
page seven, lines one to seven: **Susan T. Kluewer:** **"***I could grant you an adjournment so that you can hire counsel. I can screen you to determine if you are eligible for assigned counsel, but* ***the first step is deciding how you will be represented, whether or not there's jurisdiction*** *, and I'm asking you again, are you going to be hiring an attorney?"*

Your law dictates that a void order can be challenged in any court and NO court can grant jurisdiction where none existed ***[cf. OLD WAYNE MUT. L. ASSOC. v. McDONOUGH, 204 U. S. 8, 27 S. Ct. 236 (1907) A court cannot confer jurisdiction where none existed and cannot make a void proceeding valid. It is clear and well established law that a void order can be challenged in any court"]*** i; david: a man; demand that Susan T. Kluewer prove her constitutional jurisdiction on the record. i; david: a man demand that William D. Shanahan prove that he "represents" i; david: a man: and that he is not committing fraud; while conspiring with Susan T. Kluewer to avoid and remain silent on the question of constitutional jurisdiction on the record over i; david; a man.

EXHIBIT TWO **Page eleven lines four-eleven** ***Susan T. Kluewer; I am appointing William Shanahan to respresent you. I am adjourning this proceeding until August 17. You are to appear here on that date. If you fail to appear, I will issue a warrant for your arrest and the bail that's posted will be forfeited. August 17 you are to appear***.

i; david: a man: never hired William Shanahan; and further; he was sent a letter that defined My position on his claim that he is representing i; david; a man: and further; William Shanahan was told by Me, innumerable times that he *does not* represent i; david: a man. Susan T. Kluewer hired William Shanahan and without proof of constitutional jurisdiction on the record claims that she has assigned him to i: a man as "representation". Susan T. Kluewer has also stolen money from i; david; a man; which includes my automobile and its contents. **EXHIBIT THREE letter from Madeline Singas proving my automobile is** stolen. False imprisonment is the unlawful arrest or detention of a man or woman without warrant, or by an illegal warrant, or a warrant illegally executed.

Any restraint, however slight, upon the liberty of a man or woman to come and go as he or she pleases, constitutes an arrest. By the due process clause, the common law governs what the law on arrest is in this land, and where it exists the most statutes can be is declaratory of the common law. If there is no direct language in the constitution directing what procedure or process is to be followed, the common law is to be the due process of law followed, not a legislative statute or city ordinance. Your law is very clear that men and women acting as officers who do not abide

All rights reserved

JESUS IS LORD *Notice to the master is notice to the servant. Notice to the servant is notice to the master. [in red ink]*

by this law are trespassers and are guilty of false imprisonment. ***[cf. South Carolina v. United States, 199 U.S. 437 (1905)The Constitution is a written instrument. As such, its meaning does not alter. That which it meant when adopted, it means now. Being a grant of powers to a government, its language is general, and, as changes come in social and political life, it embraces in its grasp all new conditions which are within the scope of the powers in terms conferred. In other words, while the powers granted do not change, they apply from generation to generation to all things to which they are in their nature applicable. This in no manner abridges the fact of its changeless nature and meaning. Those things which are within its grants of power, as those grants were understood when made, are still within them, and those things not within them remain still excluded. As said by Mr. Chief Justice Taney in Dred Scott v. Sandford, 19 How. 393, 60 U. S. 426:***
"It is not only the same in words, but the same in meaning, and delegates the same powers to the government, and reserves and secures the same rights and privileges to the citizen, and, as long as it continues to exist in its present form, it speaks not only in the same words, but with the same meaning and intent with which it spoke when it came from the hands of its framers, and was voted on and adopted by the people of the United States. Any other rule of construction would abrogate the judicial character of this Court and make it the mere reflex of the popular opinion or passion of the day."

It must also be remembered that the framers of the Constitution were not mere visionaries, toying with speculations or theories, but practical men, dealing with the facts of political life as they understood them, putting into form the government they were creating and prescribing, in language clear and intelligible, the powers that government was to take. Mr. Chief Justice Marshall, in Gibbons v. Ogden, 9 Wheat. 1, 22 U. S. 188, well declared:
"As men whose intentions require no concealment generally employ the words which most directly and aptly express the ideas they intend to convey, the enlightened patriots who framed our Constitution, and the people who adopted it, must be understood to have employed words in their natural sense, and to have intended what they have said."
One other fact must be borne in mind, and that is that, in interpreting the Constitution, we must have recourse to the common law. As said by Mr. Justice Matthews in Smith v. Alabama, 124 U. S. 465, 124 U. S. 478: "The interpretation of the Constitution of the United States is necessarily influenced by the fact that its provisions are framed in the language of the English common law, and are to be read in the light of its history."

And by MR. JUSTICE GRAY in United States v. Wong Kim Ark, 169 U. S. 649, 169 U. S. 654: "In this, as in other respects, it must be interpreted in the light of the common law, the principles and history of which were familiarly known to the framers of the Constitution. Minor v. Happersett, 21 Wall. 162; Ex Parte Wilson, 114 U. S. 417, 114 U. S. 422; Boyd v. United States, 116 U. S. 616, 116 U. S. 624-625; Smith v. Alabama, 124 U. S. 465. The language of the Constitution, as has been well said, could not be understood without reference to the common law. 1 Kent, Com. 336; Bradley, J., in Moore v. United States, 91 U. S. 270, 91 U. S. 274."

All rights reserved

JESUS IS LORD *Notice to the master is notice to the servant. Notice to the servant is notice to the master. [in red ink]*

To determine the extent of the grants of power, we must therefore place ourselves in the position of the men who framed and adopted the Constitution, and inquire what they must have understood to be the meaning and scope of those grants].

EXHIBIT FOUR ***void order that interfere with my habeas corpus ;the void order in the case stylized as 1147-2017 says "Writ of habeas corpus in the nature of an application to reduce bail upon Nassau County Docket No. CR-006525-16NA" and than says in this Habeas Corpus "Writ of habeas corpus in the nature of an application to release the petitioner"***

The nature of the Writ of habeas corpus very clear it is Susan T. Kluewer and Michael Sposato to prove constitutional jurisdiction on the record. **EXHIBIT FIVE** ***habeas corpus resubmitted for a lie that the habeas corpus was for reduce bail. You only can give bail if you have proven constitutional jurisdiction to do so .Susan T Kluewer did not. The order to show cause under the same case number 2017-1147 signed by Ruth Carol Balkin which shows that there is a challenge of the constitutional jurisdiction of Susan T. Kluewer and Michael Sposato; the wrongdoers had no response; there was silence.***

Your law states that silence IS fraud when there is a legal duty to speak and it is not tolerated; it is said to be intentionally misleading [*cf.* U.S. v. Prudden, 424 F.2d. 1021; U.S. v. Tweel, 550 F. 2d. 297, 299, 300 (1977): ***Silence can only be equated with fraud when there is a legal and moral duty to speak or when an inquiry left unanswered would be intentionally misleading. We cannot condone this shocking conduct... If that is the case we hope our message is clear. This sort of deception will not be tolerated and if this is routine it should be corrected immediately.]***

Susan T. Kluewer and Michael J. Sposato never proved constitutional jurisdiction every time they where Challenge. **EXHIBIT SIX** the writ of habeas corpus signed by Colleen Denise Duffy. The writ of habeas corpus says nothing about "Nassau County Court" or to be released in connection with "Nassau County Docket No. CR-006525" the nature of the case is habeas coropus that challenge constitutional jurisdiction of Susan T. Kluewer and Michael Sposato and their constitutional authority to restrain the liberty of i: david: a man. Nassau County court never was restricted i; david: a man's liberty. Susan T. Kluewer; Michael Sposato; and; William D. Shanahan are restraining my liberty given by the living God. Priscilla Hall; Leonard Bruce Austin; Sandra Lynne Sgroi; and; Francesca E. Connolly upon their oaths of office; and; for the record say, in **EXHIBIT SEVEN;** ***the void order "Habeas corpus relief does not lie as the petitioner is not being detained (see People ex rel. Wilder v Markley, 26 NY2d 648)."*** In your law all law opposed to the constitution are null and void ***[cf. Marbury v. Madison, 5 US 137: "The Constitution of these United States is the supreme law of the land. Any law that is repugnant to the Constitution is null and void of law."]***

And further; in your law; The supreme Court of the United States dictates that the writ of habeas corpus MUST be made available ; and further; this supreme court has depended on common law usages and the history of habeas corpus both in England and in this country; the constitution and law of the land states that the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended ***[cf. "Jones v.***

All rights reserved

JESUS IS LORD *Notice to the master is notice to the servant. Notice to the servant is notice to the master. [in red ink]*

Cunningham, 371 U.S. 236 (1963) ***The habeas corpus jurisdictional statute implements the constitutional command that the writ of habeas corpus be made available. [The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it."] While limiting its availability to those "in custody," the statute does not attempt to mark the boundaries of "custody," nor in any way other than by use of that word attempt to limit the situations in which the writ can be used. To determine whether habeas corpus could be used to test the legality of a given restraint on liberty, this Court has generally looked to common law usages and the history of habeas corpus both in England and in this country. [See, e.g., McNally v. Hill, 293 U. S. 131, 293 U. S. 136 (1934); Ex parte Parks, 93 U. S. 18 (1876).]***

In England, as in the United States, the chief use of habeas corpus has been to seek the release of persons held in actual, physical custody in prison or jail. Yet English courts have long recognized the writ as a proper remedy even though the restraint is something less than close physical confinement. For example, the King's Bench, as early as 1722, held that habeas corpus was appropriate to question whether a woman alleged to be the applicant's wife was being constrained by her guardians to stay away from her husband against her will. [Rex v. Clarkson, 1 Str. 444, 93 Eng.Rep. 625 (K.B. 1722).] The test used was simply whether she was "at her liberty to go where she please[d]." [Id. at 445, 93 Eng.Rep. at 625]

So also, habeas corpus was used in 1763 to require the production in court of an indentured 18-year-old girl who had been assigned by her master to another man "for bad purposes." [Rex v. Delaval, 3 Burr. 1434, 97 Eng.Rep. 913 (K.B. 1763).] Although the report: indicates no restraint on the girl other than the covenants of the indenture, the King's Bench ordered that she "be discharged from all restraint, and be at liberty to go where she will." [Id. at 1437, 97 Eng.Rep. at 914] And more than a century ago, an English court permitted a parent to use habeas corpus to obtain his children from the other parent, even though the children were "not under imprisonment, restraint, or duress of any kind." [Earl of Westmeath v. Countess of Westmeath, as set out in a reporter's footnote in Lyons v. Blenkin, 1 Jac. 245, 264, 37 Eng.Rep. 842, 848 (Ch. 1821); accord, Ex parte M'Clellan, 1 Dowl. 81 (K.B. 1831).] These examples show clearly that English courts have not treated the Habeas Corpus Act of 1679, 31 Car. II, c. 2 -- the forerunner of all habeas corpus acts -- as permitting relief only to those in jail or like physical confinement.

Similarly, in the United States, the use of habeas corpus has not been restricted to situations in which the applicant is in actual, physical custody].

It also a lie because the nature is a writ of habeas corpus that challenges constitutional jurisdiction of Susan T. Kluewer and Michael Sposato to restrain the liberty of i: david: a man. Susan T. Kluewer and Michael Sposato never answered the habeas ***corpus.***

EXHIBIT EIGHT ***The order to show cause under the same case number 2017-1147 signed by Ruth Carol Balkin which shows that there is a challenge of the constitutional jurisdiction***

All rights reserved

of Susan T. Kluewer and Michael Sposato; the wrongdoers had no response; there was silence. Your law looks at silence as fraud when there is a legal duty to speak and it is not tolerated [cf. U.S. v. Prudden, 424 F.2d. 1021; U.S. v. Tweel, 550 F. 2d. 297, 299, 300 (1977): ***Silence can only be equated with fraud when there is a legal and moral duty to speak or when an inquiry left unanswered would be intentionally misleading. We cannot condone this shocking conduct... If that is the case we hope our message is clear. This sort of deception will not be tolerated and if this is routine it should be corrected immediately.]***

EXHIBIT NINE ***My writ of habeas corpus signed by Sylvia Ometa Hinds-Radix. In My writ of habeas corpus, i: a man; demand a halt to all restraint of My liberty until constitutional jurisdiction is proven by Susan T. Kluewer or Michael Sposato; therefore; nothing can continue to restrain the liberty of i; david: a man: until constitutional Jurisdiction is proven.*** Susan T. Kluewer made void orders for i david a man to come to court Susan T. Kluewer violates her oath of office and interferes with i: david: a man's liberty giving by the living God without proving she has constitution jurisdiction to do so.

Page eleven lines four-eleven A man acting as court officer: we are going to put you in custody. Just let her finish…Susan T. Kluewer; ***'I am appointing William Shanahan to represent you. I am adjourning this proceeding until August 17. You are to appear here on that date. If you fail to appear, I will issue a warrant for your arrest and the bail that's posted will be forfeited. August 17 you are to appear. Susan T. Kluewer law says she have to prove constitutional jurisdiction [cf. Donnelly v. Dechristoforo, 1974.SCT.41709 ¶ 56; 416 U.S. 637 (1974) McNally v. U.S., 483 U.S. 350, 371-372, Quoting U.S. v Holzer, 816 F.2d. 304, 307***

Fraud in its elementary common law sense of deceit... includes the deliberate concealment of material information in a setting of fiduciary obligation. A public official is a fiduciary toward the public,... and if he deliberately conceals material information from them he is guilty of fraud. "The law requires proof of jurisdiction to appear on the record of the administrative agency and all administrative proceedings."]

Susan T. Kluewer never answered the habeas corpus. She never proves that she had constitutional jurisdiction on the record to restrain the liberty of i; david; a man given by the living God. The Supreme Court has also held that if a judge wars against the Constitution, or if he acts without jurisdiction he has engaged in treason to the Constitution.

If a judge acts after he has been automatically disqualified by law, then he is acting without jurisdiction, and that suggest that he is then engaging in criminal acts of treason, and may be engaged in extortion and the interference with interstate commerce. Courts have repeatedly ruled that judges have no immunity for their criminal acts. Since both treason and the interference with interstate commerce are criminal acts, no judge has immunity to engage in such acts.

[cf. **Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 94 S. Ct. 1683, 1687 (1974)** *By law, a judge is a state officer. The judge then acts not as a judge, but as a private individual (in his person). When a*

All rights reserved

JESUS IS LORD *Notice to the master is notice to the servant. Notice to the servant is notice to the master. [in red ink]*

judge acts as a trespasser of the law, when a judge does not follow the law, the Judge loses subject-matter jurisdiction and the judges' orders are not voidable, but VOID, and of no legal force or effect. The U.S. Supreme Court stated that" when a state officer acts under a state law in a manner violative of the Federal Constitution, he comes into conflict with the superior authority of that Constitution, and he is in that case stripped of his official or representative character and is subjected in his person to the consequences of his individual conduct. The State has no power to impart to him any immunity from responsibility to the supreme authority of the United States."]

Susan T. Kluewer has taken two, if not three, oaths of office to support the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of the State of New York, any judge who has acted in violation of the Constitution is engaged in an act or acts of treason. *[cf. If a judge does not fully comply with the Constitution, then his orders are void, In re Sawyer, 124 U.S. 200 (1888), he/she is without jurisdiction, and he/she has engaged in an act or acts of treason. TREASON Whenever a judge acts where he/she does not have jurisdiction to act, the judge is engaged in an act or acts of treason.* **U.S. v. Will, 449 U.S. 200, 216, 101 S.Ct. 471, 66 L.Ed.2d 392, 406 (1980); Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. (6 Wheat) 264, 404, 5 L.Ed 257 (1821)*/***

Your law is very clear that an inferior court cannot take jurisdiction in and over a constitutional court [*cf.* **Ex parte Bakelite Corp. 279 U.S. 438 (1929)** *While Article III of the Constitution declares, in section 1, that the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in "such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish," and prescribes, in section 2, that this power shall extend to cases and controversies of certain enumerated classes, it long has been settled that Article III does not express the full authority of Congress to create courts, and that other Articles invest Congress with powers in the exertion of which it may create inferior courts and clothe them with functions deemed essential or helpful in carrying those powers into execution. But there is a difference between the two classes of courts.*

Those established under the specific power given in section 2 of Article III are called constitutional courts. They share in the exercise of the judicial power defined in that section, can be invested with no other jurisdiction, and have judges who hold office during good behavior, with no power in Congress to provide otherwise. On the other hand, those created by Congress in the exertion of other powers are called legislative courts. Their functions always are directed to the execution of one or more of such powers and are prescribed by Congress independently of section 2 of Article III; and their judges hold for such term as Congress prescribes, whether it be a fixed period of years or during good behavior.

The first pronouncement on the subject by this Court was in American Insurance Co. v. Canter, 1 Pet. 511, where the status and jurisdiction of courts created by Congress for the Territory of Florida were drawn in question. Chief Justice Marshall, speaking for the court, said, p. 546: "These Courts, then, are not constitutional Courts, in which the judicial power conferred by the Constitution on the general government can be deposited. They are incapable of receiving it. They are legislative Courts, created in virtue of the general right of sovereignty which exists in

All rights reserved

JESUS IS LORD *Notice to the master is notice to the servant. Notice to the servant is notice to the master. [in red ink]*

the government, or in virtue of that clause which enables Congress to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory belonging to the United States. The jurisdiction with which they are invested, is not a part of that judicial power which is defined in the 3d article of the Constitution, but is conferred by Congress, in the execution of those general powers which that body possesses over the territories of the United States."]

Therefore, i; david; a man; demand a constitutional court, protected by the united States constitution for My common law Great Writ of Habeas Corpus.

The use of any statutes, codes, rules, regulations, or court citations, within any document created by Me, at any time, is only to notice that which is applicable to government officials, and is not intended, nor shall it be construed, to mean that i: a man have conferred, submitted to, or entered into any jurisdiction alluded to thereby.

By: david: law

david: (house of Lawrence)

Sealed in the name of and the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; Amen

Dated this twenty-second day of August in the year of our Lord Two Thousand and Seventeen

God is My Witness

Romans 1:9 King James Version *"For God is my witness, whom I serve with my spirit in the gospel of his Son, that without ceasing I make mention of you always in my prayers;"* Job 16: 19 King James Version *Also now, behold, my witness is in heaven, and my record is on high. [in red ink]*

All rights reserved

Exhibit 1

DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.
COUNTY OF NASSAU, CRIMINAL PART: B

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

-against-

DAVID C. LAWRENCE,

Defendant.

DOCKET NO. CR-006525-16NA

May 26, 2016
District Court
Hempstead, New York

B E F O R E: HONORABLE PAUL MELI
District Court Judge

A P P E A R A N C E S:

For the People
HONORABLE MADELINE SINGAS,
District Attorney,
99 Main Street
Hempstead, New York 11570

BY: CHRISTOPHER MANGO, A.D.A

DAVID C. LAWRENCE, Pro Se

FRANCINE SKINNER-SPAULDING
OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

THE CLERK: Six, David C. Lawrence. This is a recall. Judge, the last time this was on, the defendant was not arraigned. You need to arraign it. He had posted $250 police bail. We need an arraignment and sent to a part.

THE COURT: Good morning.

THE DEFENDANT: Good morning. First of all, my name is -- my christian name is David. They show me as David Lawrence, the Prosecution. And the Prosecution really can't be here because I have them in Federal Court. I have their boss in Federal Court and it was filed this morning for filing -- for making a false claim through the Court.

THE COURT: Are you pleading not guilty, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: I am not pleading. I was here April 7th and I made it clear I am not pleading until jurisdiction is proven. I challenge jurisdiction. This is now a void judgement because in the transcripts the Judge now she denied jurisdiction which she can't deny jurisdiction. She ignored jurisdiction.

Which in Joyce versus U.S., United States Supreme Court says that jurisdiction when challenged, has, has to be, okay, proven. That means jurisdiction is admiralty jurisdiction, common-law jurisdiction, okay, or maritime jurisdiction. They have to prove what jurisdiction they are in before a Judge can make any kind of order for you to have jurisdiction and any man it has to be proven that this Court has jurisdiction before this Court moves on.

She gave me a date, so I have -- that Judge, I don't have the Judge, I have the woman that was acting as a Judge, I put her in Federal Court too because she ignored Joyce versus U.S..

Now, the Supreme Court is very clear on jurisdiction. Jurisdiction has to be proven before anybody moves anything, before any pleading is done, jurisdiction has to be proven.

Then she did -- the Judge acted -- the woman acting under the Judge, she also made a misdemeanor. 28USC454, okay, practices law from the bench it is a misdemeanor and the Judge answered for the prosecution, let's see Andrew Tripodi, was here. He never answered. Supreme Court is very clear about silence.

I have Darlene Harris right now in Federal Court. I have Andrew Tripodi in Federal Court. I have Sharon Jackson in Federal Court. Now this is a Federal matter. I opened the court record on March 28th. I also made by right, by the First Amendment, I sent in, I don't know if you got my paperwork, I sent hundreds of letters, about four letters to the Court, okay, asking the Court to prove jurisdiction, that it wasn't a motion. It was addressed by right, by the First Amendment that I have to redress the Court to prove jurisdiction before anything happens.

So before anything happens, a Judge has to prove they have jurisdiction over a man. If the Judge does not prove they have jurisdiction over the man, he can't continue. This case has to be dismissed, that's what the Supreme Court says.

THE COURT: Your motion is denied, sir, do you waive the reading of the rights and charges?

THE DEFENDANT: Excuse me?

THE COURT: Your motion is denied. Do you waive the reading of the rights and charges? This is an arraignment part.

THE DEFENDANT: I want the Court to prove jurisdiction.

THE COURT: People, do you want to read the rights and charges?

THE DEFENDANT: I ask the Court to prove jurisdiction. That's what I'd ask the Court to prove before they read the charges.

THE COURT: The People will proceed with a reading of your rights and charges if you don't waive the reading.

THE DEFENDANT: So, you are going to ignore Joyce versus U.S. then?

THE COURT: Sir, your request is denied.

THE DEFENDANT: I am asking you, I am asking for the record.

THE COURT: It is denied.

THE DEFENDANT: For the record, are you saying that you are not acknowledging Joyce versus U.S.? You are not acknowledging Joyce versus U.S. Supreme Court saying jurisdiction --

THE COURT: Sir, this is an arraignment part. This is where you are presented with the charges against you and have the opportunity to plead guilty or not guilty. I am giving you that opportunity. If you don't waive the charges, we will read them to you. If you remain quite, we will get that accomplished.

THE DEFENDANT: Sir, I want jurisdiction to be proven, that's all I want.

THE COURT: People, proceed with the reading to the defendant of the rights and charges against him.

MR. MANGO: Yes, your Honor, as to count one, a violation of Penal Law Section 190.23, this defendant is alleged on the 14th day of March 2016, at about 11:50 a.m., at One Columbus Drive, Lynbrook, in the County of Nassau, State of New York, to have knowingly and after being informed of the consequences of such act represent -- misrepresent his actual name, date of birth or address to a police officer or peace officer with the intent to prevent such police or peace officer from ascertaining such information.

That on that day the defendant provided the wrong date of birth, he was advised of any misrepresentation of that name and then still provided it any way.

As to count two, a violation of section 511.2(2), this defendant was charged with aggravated unlicensed operation in the second degree in that on that day he was operating his motor vehicle with five active suspensions on his license from three different dates and his driving privileges were suspended in the State of New York.

As to count three, a violation of 511.1, aggravated unlicensed operation of a motor vehicle in the third degree, this defendant is alleged to have been operating his license while his driving privileges in the State of New York were revoked based on one suspension.

As to count four, a violation of section 319.1, the defendant is alleged on the same date, time and place to have been operating his motor vehicle without insurance.

As to count five, a violation of section Vehicle and Traffic Law Section 3006B, at the same date, time and place in Lynbrook, New York, the defendant is alleged to have been operating his motor vehicle without an inspection certificate.

As to count six, a violation of section of Vehicle and Traffic Law Section 401.1, the defendant was alleged to have been operating his moter vehicle without a proper registration. This all took place in Lynbrook, County of

Nassau, State of New York.

THE COURT: How do you plea to the charge? Sir, how do you plea to those charges?

THE DEFENDANT: I am not pleading until you prove jurisdiction.

THE COURT: The Court deems you to plea not guilty. We will give you a date in the part, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: Sir, I object to that. This is my right.

THE COURT: Your objection is noted on the record.

THE DEFENDANT: But you cannot put a plea in for me. You cannot put a plea in for me. You cannot practice law from the Court.

MR. MANGO: Your Honor, the People are -- right now, if he is not entering a plea, we are not trying to prevent him from having any of his rights and People are not seeking a plea at this time. He does have a right to a lawyer and to represent himself in this matter.

THE COURT: We will put it in a part --

THE COURT OFFICER: Quite, quite.

THE DEFENDANT: I have a right.

THE COURT OFFICER: He's speaking.

THE DEFENDANT: Sir, can I speak to you, please? They are interrupting.

THE COURT OFFICER: You are interrupting.

THE DEFENDANT: I am speaking to the Judge.

THE COURT: The Court has business to conduct. Police bail is continued.

THE COURT OFFICER: He is speaking, sir.

THE COURT: We will give you a date in a part.

THE DEFENDANT: Sir, I did not plea to nothing.

THE CLERK: Part 3, June 15th.

THE COURT: The Court acknowledge that you entered no plea to the charges.

THE DEFENDANT: I entered no plea because you have not proven jurisdiction. I want to make that clear. You did not, this Court did not prove jurisdiction.

THE COURT: You have made it clear.

THE COURT OFFICER: Step out. You have the date and part. Step out.

THE DEFENDANT: Sir --

THE COURT: Sir, you have a record, that's all I can give you.

(Continued on the following page.)

THE COURT OFFICER: Step out. Step out.

* * * * *

CERTIFICATION

The foregoing is certified to be a true and accurate transcript of the original stenographic notes taken in this proceeding.

FRANCINE SKINNER-SPAULDING

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

Exhibit 2

DISTRICT COURT OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU
FIRST DISTRICT : CRIMINAL PART 3
--X

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Index No.
CR-006525-16NA

-against-

DAVID C. LAWRENCE,

Defendant.

--X

Hempstead, New York
June 15, 2016

B E F O R E: HON. SUSAN T. KLUEWER
District Court Judge

A P P E A R A N C E S:

MADELINE SINGAS, ESQ.
District Attorney - Nassau County
BY: ALYSSA MARINO, ESQ.
Assistant District Attorney

DAVID C. LAWRENCE, Defendant, Pro Se

M I N U T E S O F P R O C E E D I N G

Christopher M. Jordan
Official Court Reporter

THE CLERK: For the record, 22, David Lawrence. Judge, the file is marked -- it's not marked with anything other than he's pleads not guilty.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm here under duress.

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence, the first question I need to ask you is if you're going to be hiring an attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: No, I'm under duress. Right now this Court does not have power --

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence, please, you're gonna have to behave yourself like every other litigant who appears here.

THE DEFENDANT: There's supposed to be due process, right?

THE COURT: I'm going to ask you some questions and you're gonna have to --

THE DEFENDANT: Miss --

THE COURT: Sir -- I will not tolerate your rudeness, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm not being rude to you.

THE COURT: You are being obstructive. I'm trying to ask you some questions, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: I asked you -- for you to have jurisdiction over me, you have to prove jurisdiction and both times I came to court --

THE COURT: Sir, you are wrong, you are legally wrong.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm legally wrong?

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence, be quiet.

THE DEFENDANT: Jurisdiction cannot be ignored.

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence, are you going to be hiring an attorney? Are you going to be hiring an attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: I don't need an attorney. I'm reserving all my rights.

THE COURT: Sir, be quiet.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm reserving all my rights.

THE COURT: Be quiet.

THE DEFENDANT: This is --

THE COURT: Sir -- sir, stop talking.

THE DEFENDANT: But you -- I want due process. You're not letting me talk and you're not telling me what, how -- you're not proving jurisdiction. Is this maritime jurisdiction? I'm under the common law. Does anybody here want to prove a claim against me? Then we have to go through common-law jurisdiction. This is not --

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence, I am ordering you to be quiet.

THE DEFENDANT: You can only order me if you have jurisdiction. You don't have jurisdiction.

THE COURT: Officers, could you maybe get some people here.

THE DEFENDANT: So you're not going to give me due process; you're just going to keep talking over me and asking me questions?

THE COURT: I'm going to ask you questions about your representation. That's the first order of business.

THE DEFENDANT: I want due process. I will get representation when you prove jurisdiction. That's it. When you prove jurisdiction, that I'm supposed to be in this court, there's no problem, okay? Then you can ask me that.

THE COURT: Are you hiring an attorney, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Are you going to prove jurisdiction?

THE COURT: Sir, it is not my burden. Sir --

THE DEFENDANT: I demand --

THE COURT: Sir, are you going to be hiring an attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm not answering no questions until you prove jurisdiction. You don't want to prove jurisdiction.

THE COURT: Sir, if you are declining to answer questions --

THE DEFENDANT: I'm not declining to answer questions.

THE COURT: Sir, be quiet.

THE DEFENDANT: You're telling me I'm declining. I'm not. I'm asking for jurisdiction.

THE COURT: Be quiet, Mr. Lawrence.

We need someone to control this man.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm not doing nothing, Miss. I'm just here asking for due process.

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence, I'm asking you, are you going to be hiring an attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm not answering any questions until you prove jurisdiction.

THE COURT: Sir, be quiet.

THE DEFENDANT: We keep going around, though. I'm saying --

THE COURT: Sir, be quiet. I'm going to explain a few things to you.

THE DEFENDANT: Do you have jurisdiction?

THE COURT: Sir, be quiet.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm not a corporation.

THE COURT: Sir, I am directing you to be quiet and let me speak. You are obligated to hear a few things. I am obligated to inquire if you are fit to represent yourself. If you do not answer my questions, I will assign someone to represent you.

THE DEFENDANT: Then you'll be practicing law from the bench. You cannot assign someone for me when you are practicing law from the bench.

THE COURT: What's the bail status?

THE CLERK: Two-fifty police bail continued, Judge.

THE COURT: Sir --

THE DEFENDANT: You're not answering my --

THE COURT: Sir, you will be quiet or I will set bail on you to make sure you behave; do you understand me?

THE DEFENDANT: This is under duress.

THE COURT: Okay. You are going to listen to me.

THE DEFENDANT: I am listening to you.

THE COURT: I am obligated to ask you questions to make sure you are capable of representing yourself; otherwise, I must assign, appoint someone to represent you, and if it turns out you are able to afford that attorney, you will be required to pay. I could grant you an adjournment so that you can hire counsel, I can screen you to determine if you are eligible for assigned counsel, but the first step is deciding how you will be represented, whether or not there's jurisdiction, and I'm asking you again, are you going to be hiring an attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: I am not answering the question. I told you I'm not answering questions until this Court proves jurisdiction. Are you gonna ignore Joyce versus U.S.?

THE COURT: Sir, have a seat. I will figure out who is going to be assigned to represent you so that we can conduct business. Have a seat.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I object. You cannot assign somebody to me.

THE COURT: Have a seat until I find someone who can represent you.

THE DEFENDANT: They're not going to represent me, your Honor, they're not. You're gonna follow the law just like I have to.

(Whereupon, at a later call of the calendar, the following occurred.)

THE CLERK: For the record, 22, David Lawrence. Step back up, sir, please.

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence, since you will not answer my questions, I am appointing William Shanahan --

THE DEFENDANT: I already have a case in Federal Court. You can't appoint nobody for me.

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence --

THE DEFENDANT: USC 28454. You cannot practice law from the bench.

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence --

THE DEFENDANT: You cannot assign anybody for me.

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence, I am directing you to stop being rude.

THE DEFENDANT: How am I being rude?

THE COURT: You are being rude.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm trying to get due process and you're not giving me due process.

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence --

THE DEFENDANT: What law is that that you can refer the law to me? What law is that?

THE COURT: I am appointing --

THE DEFENDANT: What law?

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence, be quiet.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm just asking you what law?

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence, be quiet.

THE DEFENDANT: I can't ask questions?

THE COURT: No, you can't, not right now.

THE DEFENDANT: Why? Why can't --

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence --

THE DEFENDANT: And my name is not Mr. Lawrence, either. My name is David. Okay? That's my Christian name.

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence --

THE DEFENDANT: That's not my name.

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence, I am directing you to be quiet.

THE DEFENDANT: That's not my name.

THE COURT: I am appointing William Shanahan.

THE DEFENDANT: I am not accepting.

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence --

THE DEFENDANT: Oh, my goodness.

THE COURT: -- if you will not be quiet, I will adjust your bail status so that you are --

THE DEFENDANT: So you're threatening me now?

THE COURT: I am advising you.

THE DEFENDANT: No, you're threatening me that you're going to imprison me because I want due process.

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence, I want you to be quiet. I am ordering you to be quiet.

THE DEFENDANT: So I cannot speak up for myself?

THE COURT: Not right now.

THE DEFENDANT: Not right now.

THE COURT: Not right now.

THE DEFENDANT: So you're determining -- you don't have jurisdiction and you're determining your own jurisdiction without any law?

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence, be quiet, stop being rude.

THE DEFENDANT: What law?

THE COURT: You may not be rude. I am assigning William Shanahan to represent you.

THE DEFENDANT: I am not accepting him. I am not accepting him.

THE COURT: Officers, I think --

THE DEFENDANT: I don't accept. I don't -- I'm not accepting him. I don't have to accept him.

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence, I am directing you to be quiet. I am appointing William Shanahan to be --

THE DEFENDANT: I am not accepting him. He's not going to speak for me, he's not.

THE COURT: Mr. Lawrence, be quiet.

COURT OFFICER: We're going to put you in custody. Just let her finish.

THE COURT: I am appointing William Shanahan to represent you. I am adjourning this proceeding until August 17th. You are to appear here on that date. If you fail to appear, I will issue a warrant for your arrest and the bail that's posted will be forfeited. August 17th you are to appear.

THE DEFENDANT: Do you know I have a federal case open right now and I will put you on it if you don't withdraw that. You don't have jurisdiction.

THE COURT: This proceeding is concluded.

THE DEFENDANT: You do not have jurisdiction.

THE COURT: You may leave the courtroom or be put in custody.

THE DEFENDANT: No problem. No problem. I'll see you in court. Thank you.

* * *

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I hereby certify the within to be a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes in the above proceeding.

Christopher M. Jordan

Exhibit 3

MADELINE SINGAS
DISTRICT ATTORNEY

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY
NASSAU COUNTY

Re: People v. David Lawrence
Docket # 2016NA006525

PROPERTY RELEASE

Dear Lynbrook Police Department:

The Nassau County District Attorney's Office requests that Mr. Lawrence's car be released to his custody. The car is not an instrumentality of a crime, nor is it evidence of a crime. As such, this Office requests that the car be released.

Very Truly Yours,

CL

Madeline Singas
District Attorney
Nassau County District Attorney's Office

Exhibit H

Supreme Court of the State of New York
Appellate Division: Second Judicial Department

D51395
S/jr

_____AD3d_____

Submitted - February 6, 2017

L. PRISCILLA HALL, J.P.
LEONARD B. AUSTIN
SANDRA L. SGROI
FRANCESCA E. CONNOLLY, JJ.

2017-01147

DECISION, ORDER & JUDGMENT

The People, etc., ex rel. David Lawrence, petitioner,
v Susan T. Kluewer, et al., respondents.

David Lawrence, Valley Stream, NY, petitioner pro se.

Writ of habeas corpus in the nature of an application to reduce bail upon Nassau County Docket No. CR-006525-16NA, and application by the petitioner for poor person relief.

ORDERED that the application is granted to the extent that the filing fee is waived and the application is otherwise denied as academic; and it is further,

ADJUDGED that the writ is dismissed, without costs or disbursements.

The determination of the District Court, Nassau County, did not violate "constitutional or statutory standards" (*People ex rel. Klein v Kruger*, 25 NY2d 497, 499; *see People ex rel. Rosenthal v Wolfson*, 48 NY2d 230).

HALL, J.P., AUSTIN, SGROI and CONNOLLY, JJ., concur.

ENTER:

Aprilanne Agostino
Clerk of the Court

February 8, 2017

PEOPLE EX REL. LAWRENCE v KLUEWER

Exhibit 5

[redacted]

Supreme Court of the State of New York Appellate Division:
Second Judicial Department

The People of the State of New York ex rel.
david; lawrence, Petitioner,

[redacted]

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

[redacted]

Appellate Division Docket No.:
2017-1147

- against -

Susan T. Kluewer and Michael Sposato,
Respondents

~~[illegible]~~

~~This [illegible] right to resubmit for a right [illegible]~~

Upon the annexed verified petition of david: family name lawrence, dated this fifteenth day of February Two Thousand and Seventeen, and the papers annexed thereto, ~~and the demandant david: family name lawerence proof that the 'respondents' have not appeared to rebut his papers; nor entered a written rebuttal of the papers of; david: family name lawerence the facts of david: family name lawrence; stands as true. [cf. *A court cannot confer jurisdiction where none existed and cannot make a void proceeding valid. It is clear and well established law that a void order can be challenged in any court"* **OLD WAYNE MUT. L. ASSOC. v. McDONOUGH, 204 U. S. 8, 27 S. Ct. 236 (1907)**]~~

LET SusanT. Kluewer; Michael Sposato; and; the District Attorney of Nassau County [redacted] show cause before this Court, at the Courthouse thereof, located at 45 Monroe Place, Brooklyn New York 11201, on the 24th day of February 2017 at 9:30 o'clock in the forenoon of that date or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard, why an order should not be made and entered:

1. Directing the person said to be detained, david; family name lawrence; be released, for lack of constitutional jurisdiction; and; the case numbered CR-6525-16NA be discharged.

2. Granting such other and further relief as to the court may seem just and equitable. poor person [redacted] relief to reargue because of fraud. SUFFICIENT CAUSE THEREFOR APPEARING, it is

ORDERED that service of a copy of this order to show cause and the papers upon which it was made upon counsel for the Respondents and the Nassau County District Attorney by personal delivery pursuant to CPLR 2103(b)(1), or office delivery pursuant to CPLR 2103(b)(3) or overnight delivery service pursuant to CPLR 2103(b)(6) on or before February 17, 2017, shall be deemed sufficient service thereof.

DISTRICT COURT [illegible] COUNTY
2017 FEB 17 AM 10:28
CRIMINAL TERM

APPELLATE DIVISION
2ND DEPARTMENT
2017 FEB 15 PM 1:52

RECEIVED
2017 FEB 17 AM 10:03

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
February 15, 2017

[signature]

Hon. Ruth C. Balkin
Associate Justice
Appellate Division 2nd Dept.

[signature]
2/17/17

NOTE: On the return date all motions and proceedings are deemed submitted. Oral argument is not permitted (22 NYCRR 670.5[b]).

Exhibit 6

Supreme Court of the State of New York
Appellate Division: Second Judicial Department

FEE EXEMPT

MR (1)

The People of the State of New York ex rel.

david: lawrence

petitioner,

against

Susan T. Kluewer
Micheal Sposato

respondents.

~~ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE~~

HABEAS CORPUS PROCEEDING

Appellate Division Docket No.: 2017 1147

Upon the annexed verified petition of i: david: a man: (family name lawrence) dated 31st day of January A.D., 2017, and the papers annexed thereto, *and the petitioner having waived production of the person said to be detained,*

LET Susan T. Kluewer Micheal Sposato and the District Attorney of Nassau County County **SHOW CAUSE BEFORE THIS COURT,** at the courthouse thereof, located at 45 Monroe Place, Brooklyn, New York, 11201, on the 6th day of February, 2017, at 10:00 o'clock in the forenoon of that date or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard, why a judgment should not be made and entered:

1. Directing the person said to be detained, david: lawrence, be released, or be admitted to bail, or be admitted to bail in a proper amount; and, case number CR-4526-1; all bail ~~refunded~~ discharged; for lack of Constitutional jurisdiction.
2. Granting such other and further relief as to the court may seem just and equitable.

SUFFICIENT CAUSE THEREFOR APPEARING, it is

ORDERED that service of a copy of this order to show cause and the papers upon which it was made pursuant to CPLR 7005 by personal delivery to:

the respondents ~~at~~

~~or, if he or she cannot with due diligence be found, to any person having custody of the person said to be detained at the time of service, and~~

the Appeals Bureau of the Office of the respondent District Attorney of the County of Nassau ~~at~~

shall be deemed sufficient service thereof if made on or before 5:00 PM. on February 1, 2017.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
January 31, 2016

[signature]

Hon. Colleen D. Duffy
Associate Justice
Appellate Division 2nd Dept.

RECEIVED 17 JAN 31

CM FMO

Received [illegible] 2/1/17

Exhibit 7

Supreme Court of the State of New York
Appellate Division: Second Judicial Department

D51748
S/jr

_____AD3d_____

Submitted - March 9, 2017

L. PRISCILLA HALL, J.P.
LEONARD B. AUSTIN
SANDRA L. SGROI
FRANCESCA E. CONNOLLY, JJ.

2017-01999

DECISION, ORDER & JUDGMENT

The People, etc., ex rel. David Lawrence, petitioner,
v Susan T. Kluewer, et al., respondents.

David Lawrence, Valley Stream, NY, petitioner pro se.

Writ of habeas corpus in the nature of an application to release the petitioner in connection with Nassau County Docket No. CR-006525-16NA, and application by the petitioner for poor person relief.

ORDERED that the application is granted to the extent that the filing fee is waived and the application is otherwise denied as academic; and it is further,

ADJUDGED that the writ is dismissed, without costs or disbursements.

Habeas corpus relief does not lie as the petitioner is not being detained (*see People ex rel. Wilder v Markley,* 26 NY2d 648).

HALL, J.P., AUSTIN, SGROI and CONNOLLY, JJ., concur.

ENTER:

Aprilanne Agostino
Clerk of the Court

March 15, 2017

PEO. EX REL. LAWRENCE V KLUEWER

Exhibit 8

[redacted]

Supreme Court of the State of New York Appellate Division:
Second Judicial Department

The People of the State of New York ex rel.
david; lawrence, Petitioner,

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

[redacted]

Appellate Division Docket No.:
2017-1147

- against -

Susan T. Kluewer and Michael Sposato,
Respondents

~~Court appears that the [illegible] is not law~~
~~This is based on our law I have a right to resubmit for a right [illegible]~~
~~Ex rel. Norton v Shelby [illegible]~~

Upon the annexed verified petition of david: family name lawrence, dated this fifteenth day of February Two Thousand and Seventeen, and the papers annexed thereto, ~~and the demandant david: family name lawerence proof that the 'respondents' have not appeared to rebut his papers; nor entered a written rebuttal of the papers of; david: family name lawerence the facts of david: family name lawrence; stands as true. [cf. *A court cannot confer jurisdiction where none existed and cannot make a void proceeding valid. It is clear and well established law that a void order can be challenged in any court*" **OLD WAYNE MUT. L. ASSOC. v. McDONOUGH, 204 U. S. 8, 27 S. Ct. 236 (1907)**]~~

LET Susan T. Kluewer; Michael Sposato; and; the District Attorney of Nassau County [redacted] show cause before this Court, at the Courthouse thereof located at 45 Monroe Place, Brooklyn New York 11201, on the 24th day of February 2017 at 9:30 o'clock in the Forenoon of that date or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard, why an order should not be made and entered:

1. Directing the person said to be detained, david; family name lawrence; be released, for lack of constitutional jurisdiction; and; the case numbered CR-6525-16NA be discharged.

2. Granting such other and further relief as to the court may seem just and equitable. poor person [redacted] relief to reargue because of fraud.

SUFFICIENT CAUSE THEREFOR APPEARING, it is

ORDERED that service of a copy of this order to show cause and the papers upon which it was made upon counsel for the Respondents and the Nassau County District Attorney by personal delivery pursuant to CPLR 2103(b)(1) or office delivery pursuant to CPLR 2103(b)(3) or overnight delivery service pursuant to CPLR 2103(b)(6) on or before February 17, 2017 shall be deemed sufficient service thereof.

DISTRICT COURT NASSAU COUNTY 2017 FEB 17 AM 10:28 CRIMINAL TERM

APPELLATE DIVISION SECOND DEPARTMENT 2017 FEB 15 PM 12:52

RECEIVED 2017 FEB 17

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
February 15, 2017

Ruth C Balkin

Hon. Ruth C. Balkin
Associate Justice
Appellate Division 2nd Dept.

NOTE: On the return date all motions and proceedings are deemed submitted. Oral argument ~~is not permitted~~ (22 NYCRR 670.5[b]).

[signature]
2/17/17

Exhibit 9

[redacted]

FEE EXEMPT

Supreme Court of the State of New York Appellate Division:
Second Judicial Department

Cm ①

People ex rel
david, lawrence, Petitioner,

[redacted]

HABEAS CORPUS PROCEEDING
Appellate Division Docket No.: [redacted]
2017-1999

against

Susan T. Kluewer, Michael Sposato
respondents

Upon the annexed verified petition of david: family name lawrence, dated this third day of March Two Thousand and Seventeen, and the papers annexed thereto, ~~and the defendant david: family name lawrence, proof that the 'respondents' have not appeared to rebut his papers, nor entered a written rebuttal of the papers of david: family name lawrence the facts of david: family name lawrence, stands as true. [cf. A court cannot confer jurisdiction where none existed and cannot make a void proceeding valid. It is clear and well established law that a void order can be challenged in any court" OLD WAYNE MUT. L. ASSOC. v. McDONOUGH, 204 U. S. 8, 27 S. Ct. 236 (1907)].~~

LET Susan T. Kluewer, Michael Sposato; and; the District Attorney of Nassau County, [redacted] show cause before this Court at the Courthouse thereof, located at 45 Monroe Place Brooklyn NY 11201 on [redacted] March 15, 2017 at 9:30 o'clock in the forenoon of that date or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard, why a judgment should with made and entered:

1. Directing the person said to be detained, david: family name lawrence, be released, for refusal to prove constitutional jurisdiction on the record; and, the case numbered CR-6525-16NA be discharged. and no further proceedings allowed in said case until constitutional jurisdiction is proven on the record.
2. Granting such other and further relief as to the court may seem just and equitable.

SUFFICIENT CAUSE THEREFOR APPEARING, it is

ORDERED that service of a copy of this order to show cause and the papers upon which it was made ~~pursuant to the Article One Section four of the New York State Constitution and Article One Section Nine of the united States Constitution~~ by personal delivery to: the respondents and the Nassau County District Attorney's office or, if he or she cannot with due diligence be found, to any person having custody of the person said to be detained at the time of service, and

shall be deemed sufficient service thereof if made on or before 5:00 P.M. on March 6, 2017.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
March 3, 2017

Hon. Sylvia O. Hinds-Radix
Associate Justice
Appellate Division 2nd Dept.

DISTRICT COURT NASSAU COUNTY
2017 MAR -6 PM 2:37
CRIMINAL TERM

NOTE: On the return date all motions and proceedings are deemed submitted. Oral argument is not permitted (22 NYCRR 670.5[b]).

JESUS IS LORD *Notice to the master is notice to the servant. Notice to the servant is notice to the master. [in red ink]*

RECEIVED SDNY PRO SE OFFICE 2017 AUG 22 PM 1:46 S.D. OF N.Y.

'Federal Court'
at
'District Court of the united States
For the Southern District Court of New York'

a man: david: [house of lawrence]	)	
the aggrieved party	)	
	)	Action No. cv 17-
prosecutor	)	
______________________	)	
	)	DECREED
Susan T. Kluewer	)	
Michael J. Sposato	)	Emergency Writ of Habeas Corpus
William D. Shanahan; John Doe (s);	)	
	)	
Wrongdoer(s)	)	verified

Upon the annexed verified claim of david: a man [house of lawrence], dated this ________day of August in the year of our Lord two thousand and seventeen, and the papers annexed thereto, and; the demandant david's: proof that the 'wrongdoers' have not appeared in court to rebut or dispute his papers for a total of three previous demands [cases numbered 2017-1147; 2017-1999]; nor entered a written rebuttal of the papers of; david: [house of lawrence]; the facts of david; **stands as true; and; undisputed on the record. [cf.** *A court cannot confer jurisdiction where none existed and cannot make a void proceeding valid. It is clear and well established law that a void order can be challenged in any court"* **OLD WAYNE MUT. L. ASSOC. v. McDONOUGH, 204 U. S. 8, 27 S. Ct. 236 (1907)]**

Your law on constitutional jurisdiction states that deliberately concealed material information makes a public official guilty of fraud *when deliberately concealing proof of jurisdiction on the record* from the public ***[cf. Donnelly v. Dechristoforo, 1974.SCT.41709 ¶ 56; 416 U.S. 637 (1974) McNally v. U.S., 483 U.S. 350, 371-372, Quoting U.S. v Holzer, 816 F.2d. 304, 307 Fraud in its elementary common law sense of deceit... includes the deliberate concealment of material information in a setting of fiduciary obligation. A public official is a fiduciary toward the public,... and if he deliberately conceals material information from them he is guilty of fraud. "The law requires proof of jurisdiction to appear on the record of the administrative agency and all administrative proceedings."]***

All void orders discharged for no constitutional jurisdiction on the record to restraint david: a man: Your law on the writ of habeas corpus is *to insure that miscarriages of justice within its reach are surfaced and corrected* ***[cf. Harris v. Nelson, 394 U.S. 286 (1969) The writ of habeas corpus is the fundamental instrument for safeguarding individual freedom against arbitrary and lawless state action. Its pre-eminent role is recognized by the admonition in the Constitution that: "The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended . . . ." U. S. Const., Art. I, § 9, cl. 2. The scope and flexibility of the writ—its capacity to reach all manner of illegal detention—its ability to cut through barriers of form and procedural mazes—have always been emphasized and jealously guarded by courts and lawmakers. The very nature of the writ demands that it be administered with the initiative and flexibility essential to insure that miscarriages of justice within its reach are surfaced and corrected]***

LET SusanT. Kluewer; Michael Sposato; and; Madeline Singas; be commanded : To cease the all void orders and prove constitutional jurisdiction on the record.

1. To cease the restraint of david; a man's; ***liberty;*** since there is no proof of constitutional jurisdiction on the record to do so: - False imprisonment consists of any type of unlawful restraint or interference with the personal liberty of a man or women. It involves any unlawful violation of the liberty of another; it is one of the oldest violation of rights known: [cf. ***Henry de Bracton (1200-1268) Forcefully to deprive a man of freedom to go wheresoever he may is clearly a trespass.*** *False imprisonment is indeed one of the first*

JESUS IS LORD

Notice to the master is notice to the servant. Notice to the servant is notice to the master. [in red ink]

trespasses recognized by the Common Law.] **False imprisonment is classified as a tort under the common law, and also as a crime. [cf. *Street's Foundation of Legal Liability, vol. 1, p. 12, citing: Bactons Note Book, vol. 11, p. 314 (1229), pl. 465.*]** It has been labeled as a tort, a trespass, an assault, a wrong, a damage, and an injury, giving one cause to bring suit against another for a remedy. Depriving a person of their liberty is legally no different from depriving a person of their property - a theft of liberty is a wrong by which remedy can be had, just as is the case with the theft of property.

2. Susan T. Kluewer and Micheal Sposato; have had many opportunities to prove constitutional jurisdiction; on the record; in habeas corpus cases known as; 2017-1147; and; 2017-1999 however; without their submission of depositions; without their testimony of facts; without their admissions; without their affidavits; without their disputes; the court has no facts from Susan T. Kluewer; and Michael Sposato to say that there is proven constitutional jurisdiction; on the record; and;All attorneys is forbidden to add to the record; your law is very clear *[***cf.** *Statements of counsel in their briefs or argument while enlightening to the Court are not sufficient for purposes of granting a motion to dismiss or summary judgment.* [cf. **Trinsey v. Pagliaro (Trinsey v Pagliaro, D.C.Pa. 1964, 229 F.Supp. 647)**] ***William D. Shanahan; or; any other 'attorney' is forbidden to speak for david: a man:*** and further a***s per Susan T. Kluewer appointment of said attorney david; is restrained of his liberty:***

3. **All stolen monies returned; and; Susan T. Kluewer case stylized as CR-006525-NA be immediately discharged with prejudice; as no constitutional jurisdiction is proven on the record.**

4. Demanding this order be immediately set forth; if not; it is deemed prejudiced towards david; a man; **SUFFICIENT CAUSE THEREFOR APPEARING**, it is:

5. By law if any man or woman does not sign this writ of habeas corpus to obtain my habeas corpus without giving constitutional reasons; it by your law a violation of the supreme law of the land; and; an act of treason ***[cf. Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S. Ct. 1401 (1958)***

Note: Any judge who does not comply with his oath to the Constitution of the United States wars against that Constitution and engages in acts in violation of the supreme law of the land. The judge is engaged in acts of treason. The U.S. Supreme Court has stated that "no state legislator or executive or judicial officer can war against the Constitution without violating his undertaking to support it". See also In Re Sawyer, 124 U.S. 200 (188); U.S. v. Will, 449 U.S. 200, 216, 101 S. Ct. 471, 66 L. Ed. 2d 392, 406 (1980); Cohens v. Virginia, This writ habeas corpus will be documented evidence you are wars against that Constitution and engages in acts in violation of the supreme law of the land. Therefore if any man or woman that have oath to the United States Constitution does not sign without giving constitution reason why this unsigned writ of habeas corpus is not sign this writ will be that document evidence you are not complying with your oath to the united states constitution.]

6. Susan T. Kluewer says it is not her "burden" to prove constitutional jurisdiction. The void order with this case stylized as ***2017-1999*** states "*Habeas corpus relief does not lie as the petitioner is not being detained*" is discharge. Your law is very clear; the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it ***[cf. Jones v. Cunningham, 371 U.S. 236 (1963)The habeas corpus jurisdictional statute implements the constitutional command that the writ of habeas corpus be made available. The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it." While limiting its availability to those "in custody," the statute does not attempt to mark the boundaries of "custody," nor in any way other than by use of that word attempt to limit the situations in which the writ can be used. To determine whether habeas corpus could be used to test the legality of a given restraint on liberty, this Court has generally looked to common law usages and the history of habeas corpus both in England and in this country. [See, e.g., McNally v. Hill, 293 U. S. 131, 293 U. S. 136 (1934); Ex parte Parks, 93 U. S. 18 (1876).]] In England, as in the United States, the chief use of habeas corpus has been to seek the release of persons held in actual, physical custody in prison or jail. Yet English courts have long recognized the writ as a proper remedy even though the restraint is something less than close physical confinement. For example, the King's Bench, as early as 1722, held that habeas corpus was appropriate to question whether a woman alleged to be the applicant's wife was being***

JESUS IS LORD *Notice to the master is notice to the servant. Notice to the servant is notice to the master. [in red ink]*

constrained by her guardians to stay away from her husband against her will. [Rex v. Clarkson, 1 Str. 444, 93 Eng.Rep. 625 (K.B. 1722).] The test used was simply whether she was "at her liberty to go where she please[d]." [Id. at 445, 93 Eng.Rep. at 625.] So also, habeas corpus was used in 1763 to require the production in court of an indentured 18-year-old girl who had been assigned by her master to another man "for bad purposes." [Rex v. Delaval, 3 Burr. 1434, 97 Eng.Rep. 913 (K.B. 1763).] Although the reportindicates no restraint on the girl other than the covenants of the indenture, the King's Bench ordered that she "be discharged from all restraint, and be at liberty to go where she will." [Id. at 1437, 97 Eng.Rep. at 914] And more than a century ago, an English court permitted a parent to use habeas corpus to obtain his children from the other parent, even though the children were "not under imprisonment, restraint, or duress of any kind."[Earl of Westmeath v. Countess of Westmeath, as set out in a reporter's footnote in Lyons v. Blenkin, 1 Jac. 245, 264, 37 Eng.Rep. 842, 848 (Ch. 1821); accord, Ex parte M'Clellan, 1 Dowl. 81 (K.B. 1831).] These examples show clearly that English courts have not treated the Habeas Corpus Act of 1679, 31 Car. II, c. 2 -- the forerunner of all habeas corpus acts -- as permitting relief only to those in jail or like physical confinement. Similarly, in the United States, the use of habeas corpus has not been restricted to situations in which the applicant is in actual, physical custody.]

7. By law the liberty of david: a man is unlawfully being interfere with is undisputed. A habeas corpus must be signed by any man or woman that takes an oath to the United States Constitution and the laws of the land. Your law says that any law that is opposes or disagrees with the constitution is null and void ***[cf. Marbury v. Madison, 5 US 137: "The Constitution of these United States is the supreme law of the land. Any law that is repugnant to the Constitution is null and void of law.". if not sign for United States Constitution reason it will be a unconstitutional acted. You law on unconstitutional acts. [cf. Norton v. Shelby County , 118 U.S. 425 p. 442"An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; affords no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed."***

ORDERED that service of a copy of this Writ of Habeas Corpus and the papers upon which is made pursuant to Article One Section Nine of the united States Constitution by personal delivery to:

the respondents or, if he or she cannot with due diligence be found, to any person having custody of the man said to be restrained of his liberty; and; arbitrary deprivation of his property. at the time of service, **and;**
shall be deemed sufficient service thereof if made on or before _____ __.M. on _____________, _____, 20____.

Signature of____
Movant

____
clerk/ hearing officer/ magistrate/ judge

Certified as true copy

____
Date

____
Clerk

By: ____